

Revised and adopted minutes of SBAC Meeting of 17 June 2014

1. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of the 10 June 2014 were approved with minor modifications. A discussion ensued regarding clarification of the intent as to the number of short list finalists to be selected. The RFQ calls for at least 3 finalists at the RFQ stage. According to Mass General Laws (MGL) the number required is 3. However, the number can be greater, or there can also be no finalists. Also, according to MGL, the selection of a consultant from the short list must include a ranking by the SBAC.

2. Criteria for RFQ Shortlist

The consultant selection subcommittee reported on their discussions of the criteria for selection of finalists. The 10 criteria in the RFQ were reviewed, with weighting factors assigned to some criteria while other criteria were either seen as go/no go factors or were to be deferred for consideration during the review of final proposals. A criteria was added relative to the overall quality of the submission by respondents. It was noted that Doug Adams has raised the possibility of an "outlier" being a part of the finalists; that is, a team with some unique qualities that might fall short on some criteria but bring a strength in other areas that are particularly relevant to our project. It was also noted that while the selection subcommittee's process will include a numerical ranking, the information on their ranking will not be shared with the full committee, thus allowing for a neutral discussion of each team going into the final proposal and interview stage of consultant selection.

3. Green Energy Program

John Snell described an initiative by Lincoln's Green Energy Technology Committee to take advantage of the State's Green Community Grant program. Two programs are of interest relative to the School's renovation program: the Massachusetts Pathways to Zero Grant Program and the Community Clean Energy Resiliency Initiative. Discussion focused on the possibilities for applying funds from the Zero Grant Program toward improvements to Reed Fieldhouse's building envelope as well as the co-location of photo voltaics which could serve to reduce energy costs. John's request for the SBAC's support was met with approval and during the course of the next year John's committee will coordinate its efforts with the progress of plans for improvements to the Schools.

4. Components To Be Considered

The Committee continued its discussion of potential components to be considered by our selected consultants in the costing and modeling process. Steve Perlmutter shared a draft of components expanded to include a discussion of issues and opportunities associated with each component. He invited other committee members to share their thoughts on individual components which he would in turn add to his draft. The point of the effort would be to ultimately convey the range of thinking on the components with the selected consultant. Differing opinions were voiced on the expanded draft approach, the concern being that premature or incomplete observations expressed in the draft may confuse the initial effort of the selected consultants.

Another discussion focused on the concept of models. The committee acknowledged that the Town expects to see a range of models, with one being a conservative model in terms of cost and scope of improvements. Other models will feature more cost and a broader component of improvements including new facilities that enhance educational value. The committee further acknowledged that its task, working with consultants, is to communicate the alternatives to the Town describing their advantages and

disadvantages. Through an interactive process of communications the goal is to build consensus for a new plan.

5. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for 25 June at 7 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Ken Bassett